Alberhill System Project: 3rd Summary Report of Outstanding Data Requests (1/16/12)

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
4.18.1	Purpose and Need	Ch. 1.0	a) After review of the energy data provided in your reply to data requests 4.18 and 4.28, it appears that many of the energy values identified as GWH are in fact MWH. For example, 4.18 indicates that SCE 2009 annual energy sales were 101,843,760 GWH. Please review the example data gap responses that are attached and confirm. b) Provide corrected data gap responses as needed.	02/25/10		No response	
4.28.1	Purpose and Need	Ch. 1.0	After reviewing the SCE annual sales data contained in data request 4.18 with the forecasted Retail Sales contained in data request 4.28 there appears to be approximately a 18,000 GWH difference in the quantities. For example, the first shows 2009 SCE Energy sales at 101,843 GWH. The second shows SCE "Retail Annual Sales" forecasted to be 83,435 GWH in 2010 and only reaching 98,918 by 2020. Explain this discrepancy.	02/25/10		No response	
5.22	Other CEQA Cumulative	Ch. 6.0	Please provide a map that illustrates the anticipated destinations and routes of all new subtransmission/distribution line projects that SCE plans to construct as a result of the Alberhill System project. For example, please identify the communities where the installation of new 12 kV lines will become possible as a result of the Alberhill project.	01/07/10		No response	
5.24	Purpose and Need	Sec. 1.1	Please indicate which portions of the Alberhill project are being built to satisfy/comply with internal SCE requirements or guidelines. Please cite and all internal SCE guidelines/requirements that SCE relies on to support the purpose and need for the Alberhill project.	01/07/10		No response	
5.24.1	Purpose and Need	Ch. 1.0	a) Provide a complete copy of SCE's Transmission Planning Criteria and Guidelines. b) Provide other SCE internal transmission planning documentation or manuals applicable to the proposed project as well as the Valley–Ivyglen Subtransmission and Fogarty Substation project.	02/25/10		No response	
5.25	Purpose and Need	Sec. 1.2.1	The PEA includes five bullet points that disclose demographic\economic conditions in the Riverside County. Please update the data to include: ~~- Population growth for 2009.~~ ~~- Foreclosure rate for 2009.~~ -Total meters installed, removed and net installation for 2009.	01/07/10		No response	E & E obtained population data through 2010.

Alberhill System Project: 3rd Summary Report of Outstanding Data Requests (1/16/12)

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
7.38.1	Utilities and Service Systems / Project Description / Transportation and Traffic	Data Gap Request 7.38.1	a) Addressed on 08/09/11 b) Addressed on 08/09/11 c) Addressed on 08/09/11 d) Withdrawn. e) Would one or more lanes of a public roadway be closed, and if so, for how long?	07/18/11	08/09/11	Incomplete	Data Requests 7.38 and 7.38.1 refer to relocation of the agricultural water pipeline.
7.73.1	Noise	Data Request 7.73	a) Withdrawn. b) Identify the closest sensitive receptor to the proposed substation site. Indicate the distance between the closest sensitive receptor and substation perimeter wall as well as the type of receptor. Under the Riverside County General Plan, the following are considered sensitive receptors: residential uses, schools, hospitals, rest homes, long term care facilities, mental care facilities, libraries, passive recreation uses, and places of worship. c) Conduct a noise survey for the proposed substation site containing: 1. A set of daytime and nighttime background ambient noise measurements from the perimeter wall of the substation site and the closest sensitive receptor. 2. Predict substation operating noise contributions to background ambient noise levels at the substation perimeter wall and closest sensitive receptor. - Base predicted noise levels on the model of transformers to be installed and location of the transformers in the substation footprint. - Provide predicted noise levels with and without transformer cooling fans running. - If the transformer model and proposed layout of the substation have not yet been determined, provide the maximum noise contribution that two transformers with the proposed rating (560 MVA) would produce under the expected operational conditions (transformers operating simultaneously, with and without cooling fans).	02/25/10		No response	
12.7.1	Project Description	Chapter 3.0	a) Provide documentation that indicates it is SCE's standard practice to remove structures from property newly acquired by SCE. b) Complete. c) Indicate the dates and times of demolition and each structure that was demolished. Provide a figure of appropriate scale that indicates where structures were demolished and the boundary within which land was	07/18/11		No response	

Alberhill System Project: 3rd Summary Report of Outstanding Data Requests (1/16/12)

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			disturbed during demolition activities. d) Provide a list of each permit obtained for demolition of the horse ranch. e) List the number of wells and septic tank pits abated and list all associated permits obtained. Confirm that abatement was carried out in accordance with either Section 722.0 of the Uniform Plumbing Code or by methods approved by the County Building Official. f) Indicate how much solid waste was removed during demolition. Indicate how much solid waste was recycled. List the types of materials that were disposed of and the types of waste that were recycled. g) List the amount and types of hazardous wastes that were removed and how it was disposed of. h) Indicate if contaminated soil or groundwater were encountered during demolition and the actions that were taken if encountered. i) Emissions estimates were revised to include horse ranch demolition in response to Data Gap Requests #1.8 and #9.1. Update these estimates based on the actual work performed.				
12.9.1	Air Quality	Data Response 12.9	a. There are discrepancies between the distances to receptors assumed in the Localized Significance Threshold (LST) analysis presented in the worksheets provided in response to Data Request 12.9, and the distances to the closest residential structures identified in proximity to the proposed Alberhill Substation site and 500-kV transmission line routes identified by E & E's GIS department. Provide the sources used to determine the distances to the closest receptors listed in Table 5 of the LST Analysis Worksheet included with Data Response 12.9. b. Provide figures that indicate the location of the receptors identified in Table 5 of the LST Analysis Worksheet at 93, 270, and 420 meters from components of the proposed project.	01/10/12		Follow Up to Data Response 12.9 (Received 12/8/11)	
12.9.2	Project Description	Data Response 12.9	a. Explain why the import soil is required. b. Provide the geotech report cited on Sheet C1.9 (Rough Grading Plan Borrow/Disposal Plan). Sheet C1.9 was included with SCE's response to Data Request 12.9. - In addition, provide the results of all soil surveys completed for the proposed Alberhill Substation site and 5.2-acre borrow area. A soil survey would be required to determine to what extent stormwater would infiltrate soil or flow across	01/10/12		Follow Up to Data Response 12.9 (Received 12/8/11)	New project description information was provided in response to Data Request 12.9.

Alberhill System Project: 3rd Summary Report of Outstanding Data Requests (1/16/12)

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			the surface. c. Sheet C1.9 lists several raw earthwork quantities. Confirm, that the following is correct: - 91,000 cubic yards (cy) would be cut from the substation site, and 157,700 cy of fill would be required for the substation site. Hence, 66,700 cy of fill would be imported to the substation site. Due to subsidence, an additional 11,000 cy would be imported for a total of 77,700 cy of fill to the substation site. d. Explain why Data Response 12.9 indicates that if the import option is chosen rather than use of the 5.2-acre borrow area, 80,000 cy of soil would be imported from a nearby quarry, but Sheet C1.9 and Sheet 1 of 2 (Borrow Site Exhibit) indicate that 120,000 cy would be excavated from the borrow area. If the 5.2-acre borrow area is accessed to obtain the fill, how would the excess 40,000 cy of soil be used? e. SCE indicated in response to Data Request 1.22 (labeled SCE Question 22) that a detention basin would be constructed within the proposed substation walls to capture and retain surface flow within the enclosed facility. Surface flow would be gathered by gravity flow into concrete swales and directed to the basin. Percolation would dissipate water captured by the basin to reduce excess discharge from the proposed substation site. - Indicate where the detention basin would be located on Sheet C1.9 or a similar diagram. - Discuss the potential for runoff to be retained by areas excavated within the 5.2-acre borrow area. f. SCE indicated in response to Data Request 1.22 (labeled SCE Question 22) that surface runoff from the adjoining hills would be captured by a channel paralleling the substation's north wall. A surface flow energy dissipation field would be included to reduce the velocity of water captured by the external channel. Surface runoff from the south side of the substation site would be collected in a buried pipe and discharged from the property at the same location as would be discharged under conditions existing prior to construction of the proposed substation. - Indicate where the external channel, buried pipe, and other substation drainage components would be located on Sheet C1.9 or a similar diagram.				

Alberhill System Project: 3rd Summary Report of Outstanding Data Requests (1/16/12)

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			g. Update Table 3.1 (Substation Ground Surface Improvement Materials and Volumes) of the PEA to include the cut and fill data provided in response to Data Request 12.9. h. Update Sections 3.1.1.10 (Substation Drainage) and 3.1.1.11 (Substation Site Ground Surface Improvements) of the PEA to include the cut and fill data provided in response to Data Request 12.9. i. A water budget and/or analysis of stormwater runoff would be required for stormwater management and as a basis for design of the proposed detention basin, channel, underground pipes, and other drainage features. Provide the water budget or data used for stormwater runoff analyses for the proposed Alberhill Substation site and 5.2-acre borrow area.				
12.9.3	Visual Resources	Data Response 12.9	Provide new visual simulations showing the 5.2-acre borrow area after the proposed removal of 120,000 cubic yards of soil. See attached figure for reference to previous simulation showing the completed Alberhill Substation as viewed from Interstate 15, an Eligible State Scenic Highway.	01/13/12		Follow Up to Data Response 12.9 (Received 12/8/11)	See attached figure
12.11	Project Description, Biological Resources, Visual Resources	Ch. 3, Sec. 4.1, Sec. 4.4, Data Gaps 6.1, 6.1.1, 5.17, 7.7.1	a. Provide maps at a scale of 1 inch:400 feet or more detailed that show the locations where poles currently supporting each of the 115-kV line segments would be removed. Indicate (e.g., by using a key) what type of pole currently exists in each location. Number the poles on the map. Engineering maps or AutoCAD files showing street names, pole numbers, pole heights, and types of poles may be adequate. b. Provide a table for the 115-kV lines with rows that show pole/structure number and columns that specify the type of pole currently in place and the type of pole that the existing pole with be replaced with (e.g., LWS, TPS, H-frame). c. Specify, on the same maps, where staging areas, laydown areas, other work areas around pole removal sites, and pulling/tensioning/splicing sites would be located for the 115-kV lines. d. On the same maps, indicate where guard structures would be used for the 115-kV lines.	05/18/11		No response	See also 7.7.1.
14.1	Alternatives	Ch. 2	• If a modified system were constructed for an ultimate build out of two transformers and a spare at a site located just north of the proposed 115-kV Segment 8 (see Attachment A), describe the changes, additions, and improvements to existing 115-kV systems that would be required to make the	08/22/11		No response	Attachment A

Alberhill System Project: 3rd Summary Report of Outstanding Data Requests (1/16/12)

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			output from these transformers useful in meeting projected demand in a reliable and flexible manner. Assume that site improvements (e.g., grading) and acquisition feasibility would be comparable to the proposed site. Additional assumptions would be similar to those used to respond to Data Gap Request 8.1.1. - This system alternative also assumes that a smaller overall project would be constructed and operated to serve a reduced Alberhill 115-kV service area. The reduced Alberhill 115-kV service area may include - Scenario A: Ivyglen, Fogarty (proposed), and Elsinore substations; - Scenario B: Ivyglen, Fogarty (proposed), Elsinore, and Skylark substations; or - Scenario C: another combination of substations that would be sufficient to relieve load from the Valley South 115-kV System through the planning period (through 2020) if a new 500/115-kV substation were constructed for an ultimate build out of only two transformers and one spare. • In addition, instead of de-energizing (or keeping energized but not serving load) a long segment of the existing 115-kV Valley–Elsinore–Ivyglen Line as proposed, consider using this existing line along with the pending 115-kV Valley–Ivyglen Line to transmit electricity from a 500/115-kV substation constructed at one of the substation site alternatives shown in Attachment A. • If a reduced Alberhill 115-kV system were to be constructed, at what point in time would additional reinforcements be required assuming each of the scenarios described above (Scenarios A, B, and C)? - See also outstanding Data Gap Request 12.1.1 regarding when a third transformer is projected to be required at the proposed Alberhill Substation.				